REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-19, 21 and 22 remain pending in the present application. Claims 6, 7, 11 and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 12, 13 and 17-19 have been amended. Claims 21 and 22 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner has required restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 121.

I. Claims 6, 7, 11 and 20, drawn to a system for automatically selecting a blow out opening, classified in class 454, subclass 75.

II. Claims 1-5, 8-10 and 12-19, drawn to a system for controlling a temperature adjusting means responsive to a temperature, classified in class 165, subclass 202.

Applicants, without traverse, respectfully request the Examiner to proceed with Invention II defined by Claims 1-5, 8-10 and 12-19. Applicants request the non-elected claims be held in abeyance for further prosecution in future divisional and/or continuation applications.

ELECTION OF SPECIES

The Examiner has required an election of species pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 121 to one of the following patentably distinct species.

Species I:	Figures 1B-5;
Species II:	Figure 6 (a different control algorithm for the structure disclosed in Figure 1B);
Species III:	Figures 7-8 (ceiling discharge type); and,
Species IV:	An in-determinant number of other species discussed on page 25, lines 8-19 of the specification, but not illustrated.

Applicants, without traverse, respectfully request the Examiner to proceed with Species I principally illustrated in Figures 1B-5. After entry of the above amendment to the claims, Applicants believe Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12-16 read on the elected species. Applicants request that the non-elected claims be held in abeyance for possible rejoinder and/or further prosecution in future divisional and/or continuation applications.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 21 and 22 are dependent claims which Applicants believe properly further limit their respective base claim. Applicants do not believe that Claims 21 and 22 read on the elected species.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 16, 2006

By: _____
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg